UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,242	02/01/2001	Fumio Nagasaka	107926	7319

25944   7590   05/16/2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER
PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/701,242	NAGASAKA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 February 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *3,13,15,16,21,23,25 and 26* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *3,13,15,16,21,23,25 and 26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 3, 13, 15, 16, 21, 23, 25 and 26 are subject to examination. Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14,

17-20, 22, 24, 27-30 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 2/13/2006, pages 8-20, have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 3, 13, 15, 16, 21, 23, 25 and 26 is maintained.

Applicant argues (1), "the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest the

applicant's claimed individual symbols corresponding to individuals and data symbols as per

figures 9(a) and 9(b) i.e., the individual symbols corresponding to individuals are photographs

corresponding to respective individuals and the data symbols are icons representing respective

data stored in a camera device".

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to

applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is

noted that the features upon which applicant relies, "the individual symbols corresponding to

individuals are photographs corresponding to respective individuals and the data symbols are

icons representing respective data stored in a camera device", are not recited in the rejected

claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the

specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26

USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The First inquiry must be into exactly what the claims define.

See *In re Wilder*, 166 USPQ 545, 548 (CCPA 1970). What is claimed is, see claim 3 which is

related to the above arguments, "application unit that causes individual symbols corresponding to

individuals and device symbols corresponding to devices". Please refer to the below rejections

of this office action to the newly presented amended claims. Therefore, the rejection is

maintained. The specification of this application clearly states, "In the specification hereof, the

individual descriptions and the device descriptions include the names of the individuals and

devices as well as any other descriptions used to identify the individuals and devices, such as

identification numbers and codes. The device symbols include icons that are pictorial

representations of devices as well as any other user-recognizable representations that can be

displayed on the screen, such as letters or characters, figures, symbols, codes, and colors

corresponding to the devices. These are also applicable to individual symbols and data symbols

discussed later. In the case of the individual symbols, a photograph sym o or an illustration of an

individual may be used for the pictorial representation of the individual", page 4, lines 20 –25,

Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the

examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (2), "the cited art Hamner et al., 5,796,951 (Hereinafter Hamner) fails to

teach or suggest displaying individual symbols corresponding to individuals, device symbols

corresponding to devices, mapping a desired device symbol to a specific individual symbol and

obtaining and displaying individual description and/or device description information relating to

the mapping". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The

limitations, "displaying individual symbols corresponding to individuals", are rejected by

combined teachings of Hamner et al., 5,796,951 (Hereinafter Hamner), Minasi ("Mastering

Windows NT Server 4", fifth edition, 1998, pages 343 – 373, Hereinafter Minasi), Person,

"Using Windows 95", Special edition, 1995, pages 105-107 and IDEHARA ("Input-Output

Apparatus selecting method for network system", 12/20/2001, US 2001/0552995, Hereinafter

IDEHARA. In response to applicant's arguments against the references <u>individually</u>, one cannot

show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re*

Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Hamner discloses what the

claimed invention accomplishes, i.e., a device retrieving apparatus that retrieves a device among

a plurality of devices present on a network (e.g., abstract). Hamner discloses individual symbols

corresponding to individuals and device symbols corresponding to devices to be displayed on the

screen of said display unit (e.g., figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32), to link a desired first

device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol

corresponding to the desired individual (e.g., col., 4, lines 10- 48), specifying an individual

description of the desired individual corresponding to the mapped individual symbol as a specific

individual description (e.g., col., 6, lines 14 – 43, figure 2A), obtaining a device description

mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., col., 5, lines 53 –

64), mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said

plurality of devices present on the network (e.g., col., 6, lines 52 – 66), causing at least one of

the obtained device description and a second device symbol representing a device (e.g., col., 6,

lines 25 – 49) expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said

display unit (e.g., col., 4, lines 4-48, abstract, figures 1-2). Minasi, discloses the well-known

concept of mapping to a desired person (e.g., assignment of user specific information, page 349,

table, 6.1, pages 350-351, figure 6.9, page 364) using person symbol (e.g., symbols for Eric,

Darcee, Administrator, etc, figure 6.15, page 372) and the selected person information (e.g., Eric

being research assistant, etc, figure 6.15, page 372, user information, page 349, table, 6.1, pages 350-351, figure 6.9, page 364). Person, discloses well-known concept of mapping one software item to another software item (e.g., drag and drop method can be used to drag one software item and drop on another software item, page 105 – page 107). IDEHARA discloses well-known concept of usage of a database in a server / apparatus connected to the network for the individuals (e.g., paragraph 148, page 10, figures 24 and 29). With the combined teachings of Hamner, Minasi, Person and IDEHARA, the usage of individual person symbol and person information would help identify individual person symbol and correspondingly manage the information for the individual person. The user symbol would help the user manage its own personal settings of the desired items. A device retrieving apparatus would be able retrieve a device among a plurality of devices present on a network for a specific individual. Also, page 31, lines 20-23 of the specification, clearly states, "The display of icons may be replaced with the display of only series of characters or letters representing the individual names, the device names, and the data names or with the display of figures, symbols, codes, or colors corresponding to these names", page 30, lines 1 –5 of the specification, states, "The present invention is not restricted to the above embodiment or its modifications, but there may be many other modifications, changes, and alterations without departing from the scope or spirit of the main characteristics of the present invention". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (3), "the cited art Minasi ("Mastering Windows NT Server 4", fifth edition, 1998, pages 343 – 373, Hereinafter Minasi) fails to teach or suggest displaying

individual symbols corresponding to individuals, device symbols corresponding to devices,

mapping a desired device symbol to a specific individual symbol and obtaining and displaying

individual description and/or device description information relating to the mapping". The

examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The limitations,

"displaying individual symbols corresponding to individuals", are rejected by <u>combined</u>

<u>teachings of</u> Hamner et al., 5,796,951 (Hereinafter Hamner), Minasi ("Mastering Windows NT

Server 4", fifth edition, 1998, pages 343 – 373, Hereinafter Minasi), Person, "Using Windows

95", Special edition, 1995, pages 105-107 and IDEHARA ("Input-Output Apparatus selecting

method for network system", 12/20/2001, US 2001/0552995, Hereinafter IDEHARA. In

response to applicant's arguments against the references <u>individually</u>, one cannot show

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re*

Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Hamner discloses what the

claimed invention accomplishes, i.e., a device retrieving apparatus that retrieves a device among

a plurality of devices present on a network (e.g., abstract). Hamner discloses individual symbols

corresponding to individuals and device symbols corresponding to devices to be displayed on the

screen of said display unit (e.g., figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32), to link a desired first

device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol

corresponding to the desired individual (e.g., col., 4, lines 10- 48), specifying an individual

description of the desired individual corresponding to the mapped individual symbol as a specific

individual description (e.g., col., 6, lines 14 – 43, figure 2A), obtaining a device description

mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., col., 5, lines 53 –

64), mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said

plurality of devices present on the network (e.g., col., 6, lines 52 – 66), causing at least one of

the obtained device description and a second device symbol representing a device (e.g., col., 6,

lines 25 – 49) expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said

display unit (e.g., col., 4, lines 4-48, abstract, figures 1-2). Minasi, discloses the well-known

concept of mapping to a desired person (e.g., assignment of user specific information, page 349,

table, 6.1, pages 350-351, figure 6.9, page 364) using person symbol (e.g., symbols for Eric,   .

Darcee, Administrator, etc, figure 6.15, page 372) and the selected person information (e.g., Eric

being research assistant, etc, figure 6.15, page 372, user information, page 349, table, 6.1, pages

350-351, figure 6.9, page 364). Person, discloses well-known concept of mapping one software

item to another software item (e.g., drag and drop method can be used to drag one software item

and drop on another software item, page 105 – page 107). IDEHARA discloses well-known

concept of usage of a database in a server / apparatus connected to the network for the

individuals (e.g., paragraph 148, page 10, figures 24 and 29). With the combined teachings of

Hamner, Minasi, Person and IDEHARA, the usage of individual person symbol and person

information would help identify individual person symbol and correspondingly manage the

information for the individual person. The user symbol would help the user manage its own

personal settings of the desired items. A device retrieving apparatus would be able retrieve a

device among a plurality of devices present on a network for a specific individual. Also, page 31,

lines 20-23 of the specification, clearly states, "The display of icons may be replaced with the

display of only series of characters or letters representing the individual names, the device

names, and the data names or with the display of figures, symbols, codes, or colors

corresponding to these names", page 30, lines 1 –5 of the specification, states, "The present

invention is not restricted to the above embodiment or its modifications, but there may be many

other modifications, changes, and alterations without departing from the scope or spirit of the

main characteristics of the present invention". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed

subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter.

Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (4), "the cited art Person, "Using Windows 95", Special edition, 1995,

pages 105-107 fails to teach or suggest displaying individual symbols corresponding to

individuals, device symbols corresponding to devices, mapping a desired device symbol to a

specific individual symbol and obtaining and displaying individual description and/or device

description information relating to the mapping". The examiner respectfully disagrees in

response to applicant's arguments. The limitations, "displaying individual symbols

corresponding to individuals", are rejected by <u>combined teachings of</u> Hamner et al., 5,796,951

(Hereinafter Hamner), Minasi ("Mastering Windows NT Server 4", fifth edition, 1998, pages

343 – 373, Hereinafter Minasi), Person and IDEHARA ("Input-Output Apparatus selecting

method for network system", 12/20/2001, US 2001/0552995, Hereinafter IDEHARA. In

response to applicant's arguments against the references <u>individually</u>, one cannot show

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re*

Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Hamner discloses what the

claimed invention accomplishes, i.e., a device retrieving apparatus that retrieves a device among

a plurality of devices present on a network (e.g., abstract). Hamner discloses individual symbols

corresponding to individuals and device symbols corresponding to devices to be displayed on the

screen of said display unit (e.g., figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32), to link a desired first

device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol

corresponding to the desired individual (e.g., col., 4, lines 10- 48), specifying an individual

description of the desired individual corresponding to the mapped individual symbol as a specific

individual description (e.g., col., 6, lines 14 – 43, figure 2A), obtaining a device description

mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., col., 5, lines 53 –

64), mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said

plurality of devices present on the network (e.g., col., 6, lines 52 – 66), causing at least one of

the obtained device description and a second device symbol representing a device (e.g., col., 6,

lines 25 – 49) expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said

display unit (e.g., col., 4, lines 4-48, abstract, figures 1-2). Minasi, discloses the well-known

concept of mapping to a desired person (e.g., assignment of user specific information, page 349,

table, 6.1, pages 350-351, figure 6.9, page 364) using person symbol (e.g., symbols for Eric,

Darcee, Administrator, etc, figure 6.15, page 372) and the selected person information (e.g., Eric

being research assistant, etc, figure 6.15, page 372, user information, page 349, table, 6.1, pages

350-351, figure 6.9, page 364). Person, discloses well-known concept of mapping one software

item to another software item (e.g., drag and drop method can be used to drag one software item

and drop on another software item, page 105 – page 107). IDEHARA discloses well-known

concept of usage of a database in a server / apparatus connected to the network for the

individuals (e.g., paragraph 148, page 10, figures 24 and 29). With the combined teachings of

Hamner, Minasi, Person and IDEHARA, the usage of individual person symbol and person

information would help identify individual person symbol and correspondingly manage the

information for the individual person. The user symbol would help the user manage its own

personal settings of the desired items. A device retrieving apparatus would be able retrieve a

device among a plurality of devices present on a network for a specific individual. Also, page 31,

lines 20-23 of the specification, clearly states, "The display of icons may be replaced with the

display of only series of characters or letters representing the individual names, the device

names, and the data names or with the display of figures, symbols, codes, or colors

corresponding to these names", page 30, lines 1 –5 of the specification, states, "The present

invention is not restricted to the above embodiment or its modifications, but there may be many

other modifications, changes, and alterations without departing from the scope or spirit of the

main characteristics of the present invention". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed

subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter.

Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (5), "the cited art IDEHARA ("Input-Output Apparatus selecting

method for network system", 12/20/2001, US 2001/0552995, Hereinafter IDEHARA fails to

teach or suggest displaying individual symbols corresponding to individuals, device symbols

corresponding to devices, mapping a desired device symbol to a specific individual symbol and

obtaining and displaying individual description and/or device description information relating to

the mapping". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The

limitations, "displaying individual symbols corresponding to individuals", are rejected by

combined teachings of Hamner et al., 5,796,951 (Hereinafter Hamner), Minasi ("Mastering

Windows NT Server 4", fifth edition, 1998, pages 343 – 373, Hereinafter Minasi), Person,

"Using Windows 95", Special edition, 1995, pages 105-107 and IDEHARA. In response to

applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by

attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091,

231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Hamner discloses what the claimed invention accomplishes,

i.e., a device retrieving apparatus that retrieves a device among a plurality of devices present on a

network (e.g., abstract). Hamner discloses individual symbols corresponding to individuals and

device symbols corresponding to devices to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g.,

figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32), to link a desired first device symbol among the

device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol corresponding to the

desired individual (e.g., col., 4, lines 10- 48), specifying an individual description of the desired

individual corresponding to the mapped individual symbol as a specific individual description

(e.g., col., 6, lines 14 – 43, figure 2A), obtaining a device description mapped to the specific

individual description out of mapping information (e.g., col., 5, lines 53 – 64), mapping of a

plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices

present on the network (e.g., col., 6, lines 52 – 66), causing at least one of the obtained device

description and a second device symbol representing a device (e.g., col., 6, lines 25 – 49)

expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit

(e.g., col., 4, lines 4-48, abstract, figures 1-2). Minasi, discloses the well-known concept of

mapping to a desired person (e.g., assignment of user specific information, page 349, table, 6.1,

pages 350-351, figure 6.9, page 364) using person symbol (e.g., symbols for Eric, Darcee,

Administrator, etc, figure 6.15, page 372) and the selected person information (e.g., Eric being

research assistant, etc, figure 6.15, page 372, user information, page 349, table, 6.1, pages 350-351, figure 6.9, page 364). Person, discloses well-known concept of mapping one software item to another software item (e.g., drag and drop method can be used to drag one software item and drop on another software item, page 105 – page 107). IDEHARA discloses well-known concept of usage of a database in a server / apparatus connected to the network for the individuals (e.g., paragraph 148, page 10, figures 24 and 29). With the combined teachings of Hamner, Minasi, Person and IDEHARA, the usage of individual person symbol and person information would help identify individual person symbol and correspondingly manage the information for the individual person. The user symbol would help the user manage its own personal settings of the desired items. A device retrieving apparatus would be able retrieve a device among a plurality of devices present on a network for a specific individual. Also, page 31, lines 20-23 of the specification, clearly states, "The display of icons may be replaced with the display of only series of characters or letters representing the individual names, the device names, and the data names or with the display of figures, symbols, codes, or colors corresponding to these names", page 30, lines 1 –5 of the specification, states, "The present invention is not restricted to the above embodiment or its modifications, but there may be many other modifications, changes, and alterations without departing from the scope or spirit of the main characteristics of the present invention". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues, (6) "the Minasi ("Mastering Windows NT Server 4", fifth edition, 1998, pages 343 – 373, Hereinafter Minasi) reference does not disclose, "person symbols and

person information". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Minasi teaches the limitations, "person symbols (e.g., symbols for Eric, Darcee, Aministrator, etc, figure 6.15, page 372) and person information (e.g., Eric being research assistant, etc, figure 6.15, page 372, user information, page 349, table, 6.1, pages 350-351, figure 6.9, page 364)". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of these actions. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues, (7) "the combined teachings of the cited references may disclose all of the features of the claims but the motivation is inadequate to combine the references as the prior art references fail to provide a suggestion or motivation and the combination of references is made using improper hindsight reconstruction of the references". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. What applicant is trying to accomplish as an invention, i.e., a device retrieving apparatus that retrieves a device among a plurality of devices present on a network, is clearly taught by Hamner et al., 5,796,951, see abstract. The well-known concept of assigning network resource to a desired person, (e.g., table, 6.1, pages 350-351, figure 6.9, page 364, figure 6.15, page 372, user related information on page 349), is taught by Minasi. The well known concept of dragging a software item and dropping it on another software item is taught by Person, "Using Windows 95", Special edition, 1995, pages 105-107. Minasi's teachings of having user related information would help assign a network resource to a desired person. Hence, the user would be able to easily identify their personal items and manage their own personal settings. Person's teachings of dragging a software item and dropping it on another software item would help mapping of the user and the user related information. Also, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily

incorporated into the structure of a primary reference. It is also not that the claimed invention

must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the

combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinally skill in the art.

In re Keller, 642 F.2d 414, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981); In re Young, 927 F.2d 588,

591, 18 USPQ2d 1089, 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In response to applicant's argument that the

examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be

recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based

upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within

the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include

knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In*

re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Therefore, the rejection is

maintained.

Priority

3.   Applicant was requested (previous office actions dated, 8/30/2004 and 4/15/2005) to

submit the translated priority document <u>in English</u> for the foreign priority document (i.e.,

claimed priority, JAPAN H-1191196 03/31/1999) for verification, in order to benefit the

effective date as 03/31/1999. However, examiner has still not received the English translated

foreign priority document. Examiner has not applied prior arts that are <u>available</u> for the rejection

(dated between the claimed France priority date 03/31/1999 and the effective date, 3/31/2000 of

this application). Applicant is requested to respond/submit the English translated foreign priority

document, which would help the examiner to know whether to apply, the above-mentioned prior

arts dated between 03/31/1999 and 3/31/2000 (see 37 CFR 1.55(a)(3)) and MPEP 706.02(b)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 3, 15, 16, 21, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hamner in view of Minasi, Person and IDEHARA and Malkin et al., 5,940,391 (Hereinafter

Malkin).

6.   As per claims 3 and 21, Hamner discloses a device retrieving apparatus that retrieves a

device among a plurality of devices present on a network (e.g., abstract), comprising:

a display unit having a screen (e.g., col., 3, lines 6 – 24, figure 2A),

an input that is used to externally input an instruction (e.g., col., 3, lines 15 – 24); and

an application/control unit that (e.g., computer using software, col., 3, lines 25 – 44),

causes individual symbols corresponding to individuals and device symbols

corresponding to devices to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., figure 2A, figure

2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32),

said application/control unit (e.g., computer using software, col., 3, lines 25 – 44), when

an instruction is given externally via said input unit (e.g., col., 3, lines 5 – 24) to link a desired

first device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual

symbol corresponding to the desired individual (e.g., col., 4, lines 10- 48), specifes an individual

description of the desired individual corresponding to the mapped specific individual symbol as a

specific individual description (e.g., col., 6, lines 14 – 43, figure 2A), gains access to a database

that is present on the network (e.g., col., 6, lines 52 – 66), obtains a device description mapped to

the specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., col., 5, lines 53 – 64), which

is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device

descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network (e.g., col., 6, lines 52 –

66), and causes at least one of the obtained device description and a second device symbol

representing a device (e.g., col., 6, lines 25 – 49) expressed by the obtained device description to

be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., col., 4, lines 4-48, abstract, figures 1-2).

Hamner does not specifically mention about mapping to a desired person, individual

symbol corresponding to person and individual information corresponding to the selected person.

Minasi, discloses the well-known concept of mapping to a desired person (e.g., assignment of

user specific information, page 349, table, 6.1, pages 350-351, figure 6.9, page 364) using person

symbol (e.g., symbols for Eric, Darcee, Aministrator, etc, figure 6.15, page 372) and the selected

person information (e.g., Eric being research assistant, etc, figure 6.15, page 372, user

information, page 349, table, 6.1, pages 350-351, figure 6.9, page 364),

Hamner also discloses said control unit in the case where a device represented by the first

device symbol keeps data, causes data symbols representing respective data kept in the device to

be displayed in a specific area on the screen of said display unit (e.g., figure 2A, figure 2B, col.,

4, lines 17 – 32), which is different from an area in which at least one of the obtained device

description and corresponding second device symbol is displayed (e.g., figure 2A, figure 2B,

col., 4, lines 17 – 32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner with the teachings of Minasi in order to facilitate assigning person specific information because the usage of individual person symbol and person information would help identify individual person symbol and correspondingly manage the information for the individual person. The user symbol would help the user manage its own personal settings of the desired items.

Hamner and Minasi do not specifically mention about mapping one software item to another software item. Person, discloses well-known concept of mapping one software item to another software item (e.g., drag and drop method can be used to drag one software item and drop on another software item, page 105 – page 107).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner and Minasi with the teachings of Person in order to facilitate mapping one software item to another software item because dragging a software item and dropping it on another software item would help mapping of a user symbol to the device symbol. Dragging a device symbol on the user's symbol or the window containing the user's personal settings would be an easier way of mapping a device to the desired user.

Hamner and Minasi do not specifically mention about a database in a server connected to the network. IDEHARA discloses well-known concept of a database in a server / apparatus connected to the network (e.g., paragraph 148, page 10, figures 24 and 29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Minasi and Person with the teachings of IDEHARA in order to facilitate utilizing a database in a server / apparatus over the network

because the server / apparatus would help connect to the network. The database would help

utilize the server / apparatus resources and the database would help store information.

Hamner also discloses said application/control unit in the case where the device causing

data symbols representing respective data kept in the device to be displayed in a specific area on

the screen of said display unit (e.g., figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32), which is an area

in which at least one of the obtained device description and the corresponding second device

symbol is displayed (e.g., figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32).

Hamner, Minasi, Person and IDEHARA do not specifically mention about different

areas. Malkin discloses usage of communications path abstraction unit along with different (e.g.,

col., 4, lines 31 – 48, col., 1, lines 51 – 67, col., 6, lines 3 – 46, col., 4, lines 9 – 48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Person, Minasi and IDEHARA with the

teachings of Malkin in order to facilitate usage of different areas because the different areas

would support displaying information as per the area specific information.

7.   As per claims 15, 16, Hamner, Person, Minasi and IDEHARA teach the claimed

limitations as rejected above. Hamner, Person and Minasi do not specifically mention about the

claimed subject matter of claims 15 and 16.

IDEHARA teaches when an individual description of the desired person is externally

input as a specific individual description via said input unit (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph

131, col., 8), gaining access to a database that is present in said server (e.g., paragraph 148, page

10, figures 24 and 29), obtaining a device description mapped to the input specific individual

description out of mapping information (e.g., figures 16 and 17, paragraph 132, col.,3) which is

stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device

descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network (e.g., figure 21,

paragraph 142), and causing at least one of the obtained device description and a device symbol

representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen

of said display unit (e.g., figures 25 and 26, paragraph 151),

when an instruction is given externally via said input unit to select a specific individual

symbol corresponding to the desired person among the individual symbols displayed on the

screen (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph 131, col., 8), specifying an individual description of the

desired person corresponding to the selected specific individual symbol as a specific individual

description (e.g., figures 16 and 17, paragraph 132, col.,3), gaining access to a database that is

present in said server (e.g., paragraph 148, page 10, figures 24 and 29), obtaining a device

description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., figure

21, paragraph 142), which is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of

individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the

network (e.g., figures 25 and 26, paragraph 151), and causes at least one of the obtained device

description and a device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device

description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph

131, col., 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Person and Minasi with the teachings of

IDEHARA because IDEHARA's teachings would facilitate handling of device description

information for an individual description information because the external input using keyboard

would help enter specific individual description of the desired person and a database would help

store the mapping information including a plurality of individual descriptions and device

descriptions for the plurality of devices present on the network. The mapping information would

help access a device description mapped to the specific individual description. The device

description and device symbol information would help display the device related information on

the screen of the display unit.

8.   As per claims 25, 26, Hamner, Person, Minasi, IDEHARA and Malkin teach the claimed

limitations as rejected above. Hamner, Person and Minasi do not specifically mention about the

claimed subject matter of claims 25 and 26.

IDEHARA teaches when an individual description of the desired person is externally

input as a specific individual description via said input unit (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph

131, col., 8), gaining access to a database that is present in an apparatus (e.g., paragraph 148,

page 10, figures 24 and 29) connected to the network or in said device retrieving apparatus (e.g.,

figures 2 and 33, paragraph 43, col., 3), obtaining a device description mapped to the input

specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., figures 16 and 17, paragraph

132, col.,3) which is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual

descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network

(e.g., figure 21, paragraph 142), and causing at least one of the obtained device description and

corresponding second device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device

description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., figures 25 and 26, paragraph 151),

when an instruction is given externally via said input unit to select a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person among the individual symbols displayed on the screen (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph 131, col., 8), specifying an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the selected specific individual symbol as a specific individual description (e.g., figures 16 and 17, paragraph 132, col.,3), gaining access to a database that is present in an apparatus (e.g., paragraph 148, page 10, figures 24 and 29) connected to the network or in said device retrieving apparatus (e.g., figure 21, paragraph 142), obtaining a device description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., figure 21, paragraph 142), which is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network (e.g., figures 25 and 26, paragraph 151), and causes at least one of the obtained device description and a device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph 131, col., 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Person, Malkin and Minasi with the teachings of IDEHARA because IDEHARA's teachings would facilitate handling of device description information for an individual description information because the external input using keyboard would help enter specific individual description of the desired person and a database would help store the mapping information including a plurality of individual descriptions and device

descriptions for the plurality of devices present on the network. The mapping information would

help access a device description mapped to the specific individual description. The device

description and device symbol information would help display the device related information on

the screen of the display unit.

9.   Claims 13, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner, in

view of Minasi, Person, Malkin and IDEHARA in view of Hogan et al. 5,414,809 (Hereinafter

Hogan).

10.   As per claim 13, Hamner, Person, Minasi and IDEHARA teach the claimed limitations as

rejected above. IDEHARA also teaches mapping information including the device positions -

related information with regard to mapping of positions related to devices to the device

descriptions (e.g., different devices, fax machines, printers, etc., network devices location in the

building, i.e., floor location, figure 25, paragraphs 130 -154), and said application/control unit

(computer using software, paragraphs 130 -154) specifys a position mapped to the specific

individual description (e.g., assigning of a fax machine, a printer or a network device from a

desired floor location for an individual, paragraphs 130 -154), reads a device description mapped

to the specified position out of the device positions-related information (e.g., accessing of the

database for a fax machine, printer or a network device from a desired floor location for an

individual, paragraphs 130 - 154), and obtains the read-out device description as the device

description mapped to the specific individual description (e.g., display of an assigned network

device, i.e., fax machine, a printer floor location for an individual, paragraphs 134 -154). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

combine the teachings of Hamner, Person, Malkin and Minasi with the teachings of IDEHARA

in order to facilitate handling of device position-related information because the information of

location available for the device for an individual would help select the device and have it linked

in the device selection.

Hamner, Person, Minasi, Malkin and IDEHARA do not specifically mention about

individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to

individuals to individual descriptions. Hogan teaches individual positions-related information

with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual descriptions (e.g.,

displaying, entering, mapping and storing of an individual floor location for an individual, figure

5, col., 46, line 60 - col., 55, line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Person, Minasi,

Malkin and IDEHARA with the teachings of Hogan in order to facilitate individual positions-

related information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual

descriptions because the information about an individual including the location of an individual's

office would help link with an individual' s other information and the referenced information

would help individual information displayed on the computer monitor when necessary.

11.   As per claims 23, Hamner, Person, Minasi, Malkin and IDEHARA teach the claimed

limitations as rejected above. IDEHARA also teaches mapping information including the device

positions -related information with regard to mapping of positions related to devices to the

device descriptions (e.g., different devices, fax machines, printers, etc., network devices location

in the building, i.e., floor location, figure 25, paragraphs 130 -154), and said control unit

(computer using software) specifying a position mapped to the specific individual description

(e.g., assigning of a fax machine, a printer or a network device from a desired floor location for

an individual, paragraphs 130 -154), reading a device description mapped to the specified

position out of the device positions-related information (e.g., accessing of the database for a fax

machine, printer or a network device from a desired floor location for an individual, paragraphs

130 - 154), and obtaining the read-out device description as the device description mapped to the

specific individual description (e.g., display of an assigned network device, i.e., fax machine, a

printer floor location for an individual, paragraphs 134 -154). It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of

Hamner, Person, Malkin and Minasi with the teachings of IDEHARA in order to facilitate

handling of device position-related information because the information of location available for

the device for an individual would help select the device and have it linked in the device

selection.

Hamner, Person, Minasi, Malkin and IDEHARA do not specifically mention about

individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to

individuals to the individual descriptions. Hogan teaches individual positions-related

information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual

descriptions (e.g., displaying, entering, mapping and storing of an individual floor location for an

individual, figure 5, col., 46, line 60 - col., 55, line 10). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner,

Person, Minasi, Malkin and IDEHARA with the teachings of Hogan in order to facilitate

individual positions-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to

individuals to the individual descriptions because the information about an individual including

the location of an individual's office would help link with an individual's other information and

the referenced information would help individual information displayed on the computer monitor

when necessary.

Conclusion

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or

sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the

convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings

of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages

and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing

responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the

claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by

the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to

8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

Haresh Patel

May 12, 2006